

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

		;		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,587	02/21/2006	William E. Beschorner	000241.00003	1006
²²⁹⁰⁷ BANNER & W	7590 05/15/200 /ITCOFF, LTD.	EXAMINER		
1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200			SAJJADI, FEREYDOUN GHOTB	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/527,587	BESCHORNER ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Fereydoun G. Sajjadi	1633			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
2a) ☐ 3) ☐	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) 1-12 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.	vn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine. The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Art Unit: 1633

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

1. This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-6 and 9-12, drawn to a method of engrafting foreign cells within a fetal non-human animal, wherein said cells are derived from the same species.

Group II, claim(s) 1-5 and 7-12, drawn to a method of engrafting foreign cells within a fetal non-human animal, wherein said cells are derived from a different species.

37 CFR 1.475 (c) states:

"If an application contains claims to more or less than one of the combinations of categories of invention set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, unity of invention might not be present."

37 CFR 1.475 (e) states:

"The determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim."

In view of 37 CFR 1.475 (e), Groups I and II are considered a plurality of the inventions listed in claim 1 for example.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features. According to PCT Rule 13.2, unity of invention exists only when a shared same or corresponding special technical feature is a contribution over the prior art. The technical

Application/Control Number: 10/527,587

Art Unit: 1633

feature, which is shared by Groups I and II, is the engrafting of foreign cells to a fetal non-human animal. Groups I and II do not share a special technical feature over the art because Surbek et al. (Hum. Reprod. Update 7:85-91; 2001), disclose hematopoietic stem cell transplantation to a fetus *in utero* (Abstract), and further address fetal conditioning involving ablation of host cells by cytotoxic regimens or irradiation prior to transplantation (second column, p. 87).

Page 3

Group I and II claims are drawn to distinct methods that utilize distinct steps, requiring non-coextensive search and examination. In the instant case, transplantation from the same species (allogeneic) is distinct from transplantation from a different species (xenogeneic) and involves additional considerations of feasibility. Thus, it follows from the preceding analysis that the claimed inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding technical features for the reasons set forth above.

2. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

A specific suicide gene, as recited in claim 3.

A specific type of tissue, as recited in claim 4.

A specific non-human animal, as recited in claim 5.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after

Application/Control Number: 10/527,587

Art Unit: 1633

the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Claims 3, 4 and 5, and claims dependent therefrom correspond to all the species listed above.

The following claim(s) are generic: 1-12.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: As the technical features linking the members do not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, particularly since the thymidine kinases, cytosine deaminase, caroxylesterase, carboxypeptidase, deoxycitidine kinase, guanosine-xanthin phosphoribosyl transferase, nitroreductase, purine nucleoside phosphorylase are structurally and functionally distinct, having no substantially shared common technical features, where each is not required for the other, requiring non-coextensive search and examination of their respective subject matter. Similarly, the different tissue types: the liver, endothelium, myocardium, skeletal muscle, smooth muscle, stem cells, lung, intestine, kidney, endocrine tissue, cartilage and bone; and the mammals: primate, artiodactyls, rodent, carnivore and lagomorph, do not share a substantially common structural feature or function, the requirement for unity of invention is not fulfilled.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In

Art Unit: 1633

either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fereydoun G. Sajjadi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3311. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach can be reached on (571) 272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fereydoun G. Sajjadi, Ph.D.

Examiner, AU 1633

ANNE M. WEHBE' PH.D